

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-20 remain pending in the present application. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 11 and 13 have been amended. Claim 20 is new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 7, 14, 11 and 12 are objected to because of informalities. Claims 7 and 11 have been amended to overcome the objections. Claim 12 depends from Claim 11. Claim 14 depends from Claim 7. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 4 has been amended to overcome the rejection. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Kamerman (U.S. Pat. No. 6,067,291). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Kamerman (U.S. Pat. No. 6,067,291).

Claims 3 and 8 are characterized in that the base station (e.g., Fig. 1) has a plurality of communication area sectors (e.g., Fig. 17) corresponding to antenna

elements, that the base station (identifier means 90, 210) determines whether there are at least two terminal stations (at least one hidden terminal station) 110 based on signal receptions of its antenna elements, and that the base station (sector notifying means 90, 220) notifies one terminal station of the location of another terminal station (hidden terminal).

Kamerman, et al. is also directed to a CSMA wireless system. In Kamerman, et al., each terminal station 18-1, 18-2 has a defer threshold circuit 72 in addition to a carrier detect threshold circuit 70. The defer threshold circuit 72 is provided because another terminal station (hidden terminal) is expected to possibly exist at the opposite location with respect to a base station 12. Kamerman, et al., however, fails to teach the above-pointed three characterized features of Claims 3 and 8.

Thus, Applicants believe Claims 3 and 8, as amended, patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamerman (U.S. Pat. No. 6,067,291). Claim 2 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 2 and Claim 2 has been cancelled. Thus, Applicants believe Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 10, which depends from Claim 1, is

also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding Claim 4, Claim 4 depends from Claim 3. As stated above, Claim 3 has been amended and is now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claim 4 is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamerman (U.S. Pat. No. 6,067,291) in view of Yoneda (U.S. Pat. No. 5,852,405). Claim 11 has been amended to include the limitations of amended Claim 3. Thus, the above discussion regarding amended Claim 3 applies to Claim 11 also. In addition, Claim 11 defines that the terminal calculates the orientation of the hidden terminal based on the notified sector information and changes its directivity to the hidden terminal. Yoneda fails to teach this feature. Applicants believe that amended Claim 11, which include the limitations of amended Claim 3, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 12, which depends from Claim 11, is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 23, 2004

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg